

REMARKS:

- 1) A minor clarification has been made on page 6 of the specification. New matter is not involved in this clarification. The abstract has not been amended. The acceptance of the drawings is appreciated. The acknowledgement of the priority claim and the receipt of the priority document is appreciated. The claims, particularly claim 1, have been clarified to more clearly distinguish between an accessibility by personnel only and another accessibility by passengers and personnel. New matter is not involved in the clarifications of the claims.
- 2) As is explained in the present specification page 3, lines 10 to 14 it is one of the purposes of the invention to provide an information fixture as a modular unit that has certain passenger conveniences which are accessible to passengers and personnel while other features particularly cabin control features are accessible only by a member of the personnel but not by any passengers.
- 3) In order to define this purpose more clearly, claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the control and monitoring section installed in the housing is for use only by and accessible only to personnel while a passenger service section installed in the housing is for use and accessible by passengers and personnel.
- 4) The rejection of original claims 1, 4, 9 and 12 as being anticipated by US Patent 6,487,280 (Akinbi) is respectfully

traversed because Akinbi does not show any separate accessibilities for separate groups of people to the multimedia data accessing and sending system, much less does Akinbi show details how such separate accessibility should be achieved.

5) While it is true that the multimedia data accessing and sending system according to Akinbi is accessible "by passengers and personnel", different accessibilities for different groups of people are neither disclosed nor suggested by Akinbi.

6) The Office Action refers on page 2 expressly to col. 4, lines 23 to 25 and to col. 5, lines 1 to 4 apparently for the purpose of interpreting the disclosure of Akinbi to the effect that controlled separate accessibilities are provided for passengers and crew. The passages in the Akinbi disclosure read as follows:
Col. 4, lines 23 to 25:

"A processor for processing data is positioned in the housing 12. The processor is a conventional computing apparatus."

Col. 5, lines 1 to 4:

"Ideally, the device also includes a floppy drive 42 for receiving computer disks. The floppy drive 42 being operationally coupled to the processor 20."

It is respectfully submitted that it is not understood how these two passages either in the context of the Akinbi disclosure or read by themselves support the conclusion that passengers shall have a more limited access compared to the crew members. In fact, the entire Akinbi disclosure does not have any features

that would permit the separate control of the accessibility to passengers on the one hand and a quite different accessibility to crew members on the other hand. A limited accessibility for repair purposes does *not anticipate* a clear separation of accessibilities for control purposes by different groups of people. Therefore Akinbi does not anticipate present claims 1, 4, 9 and 12. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) of claims 1, 4, 9 and 12 is respectfully requested.

- 7) The interpretation of present claim 4 in the light of the disclosure of Akinbi is respectfully traversed and the rejection of claim 4 as being anticipated by Akinbi is correspondingly respectfully traversed. The brief figure description in col. 4, lines 4 to 10 of Akinbi says expressly that:

"Fig. 2 is a schematic front view of an alternative arrangement of devices of the present invention"

(emphasis added). Nothing is disclosed in Akinbi regarding the shiftability of various components for positioning any one of the built-in components between a retracted position and a use position. The keyboard 24 in Fig. 1 of Akinbi has a slanted position as illustrated by the perspective view of Fig. 1. On the other hand Fig. 2 of Akinbi shows the keyboard and the entire unit in a plan front view so that it is not possible to ascertain the actual position of the keyboard 24 in Fig. 2 of Akinbi. Much less is it possible to guess whether Akinbi's keyboard is shiftable between a retracted position and a projected position. In col. 3, lines 36 to 38, Akinbi discloses that the keyboard for inputting data into the processor is positioned in the front side

of the housing. However, no disclosure is shown in Akinbi regarding the possibility of positioning the keyboard in different positions namely a recessed position and a use position as claimed in claim 4. The "guide means" which according to the Office Action are "not numbered" are also not present in the Akinbi disclosure because the keyboard 24 is shown in both figures as a fixed component. Therefore, the keyboard 24 of Akinbi cannot be shifted from a recessed non-use position into an extended use position and vice versa. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

- 8) The rejection of claim 9 as being anticipated by Akinbi in view of Figs. 1 and 2 and the corresponding specification of Akinbi is respectfully traversed because claim 9 depends from claim 1 and therefore includes the controlled accessibility for different groups of people. Such disclosure is not provided by Akinbi. Akinbi's multimedia data accessing and sending system clearly does not disclose any "cabin system control center" for that reason alone Akinbi cannot anticipate claim 9 as set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 as being anticipated by Akinbi is respectfully requested.
- 9) The rejection of claims 2, 3, 5, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in the light of the above discussed Akinbi disclosure taken in view of US Patent 6,475,087 (Cole) is respectfully traversed.

- 10) Claim 2 has been amended as shown above to define an opening 14 that functions as a "reach through opening". The door 34 of Cole is provided with a window that cannot be used as a reach through opening because the opening in the door 34 is permanently covered by a panel 68 mounted over the opening forming the frame for the window 66. The panel 68 permits the user to see only a portion of each reel 48 in the gaming device 22, please see col. 6, lines 44 to 62 of the Cole disclosure. Therefore combining the door 34 of Cole with the apparatus of Akinbi will not result, much less suggest the reach through opening (14) in the door as now more clearly defined in claim 2 as amended. The see through panel suggested by Cole in col. 6, lines 44 to 62 is to permit a "screening function" so that the user in fact does not have access to the individual items behind the see through panel. Such a construction does not make any suggestion toward the reach through opening as defined in present claim 2. A reach through opening is not a see through window and the latter does not suggest the former, particularly where the "screening function" permits the user to see only a portion of a reel located behind the see through panel 68 as disclosed in Cole. Thus, it would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to use Cole's door with a fixed window panel for the purposes of providing different access capabilities for different groups of users. A closed and locked door would prevent any use of the Akinbi device. Thus, the purpose of Akinbi would be defeated.

- 11) Providing the Akinbi system with a door according to Cole would neither result much less suggest the structure of the invention namely a door with a reach through opening. As correctly stated in the Office Action the door according to Cole provides access for repair purposes or a privacy structure for the user who has a key. However, these functions do not suggest a door with a reach through opening as now more clearly claimed in amended claim 2.
- 12) The rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully traversed because claim 3 has also been clarified with regard to the reach through opening (14) in the door (3). Neither Akinbi nor Cole mentions anything regarding an installation in a passenger conveyance, contrary to the assumption made in the Office Action after gaining knowledge of the present invention. Akinbi merely mentions "a plurality of data manipulating devices in a central location", please see col. 1, lines 53 and 54 of Akinbi. A "central location" does not suggest a passenger conveyance.
- 13) The rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully traversed. The interpretation of Cole that the built-in components "are accessible for use through said opening in said door when the door is closed" is in error. Reference is made in this respect to col. 6, lines 43 to 62 of the Cole disclosure. A see through panel is not a reach through opening. In col. 8 starting at line 19 Cole mentions a display 190 that can replace the window panel 68. However, even in that case the display

would not have a reach through opening. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner considers the Cole disclosure for what it actually is rather than to read it in the light of the disclosure of the present invention.

14) With regard to claims 10 and 11, neither Akinbi nor Cole discloses anything regarding installing a modular communication fixture in an entrance and exit area of a passenger conveyance. Additionally, the above remarks with regard to the reach through opening in the door 3 apply as well to claims 10 and 11 which both have been clarified by defining the door as having a reach through opening 14. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 10 and 11 is respectfully requested.

15) The rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully traversed. Claims 6 and 7 have been amended to more clearly distinguish the features of the invention claimed in 6 and 7 from the prior art. Both claims 6 and 7 as amended now define the reach through opening (14) and its relationship to other components more clearly. The statement that Akinbi discloses "the device as claimed" is respectfully traversed because Akinbi does not provide any access limitation to a certain group of people such as passengers while permitting full access to all components to another group of people such as flight attendants. The combination of the door 3 with a convenience shelf 34 as disclosed by Tyndall for a portable work shop, with the multi media data accessing and sending system as disclosed by Akinbi would neither result much less suggest the

features now more clearly claimed in amended claims 6 and 7 where the reach through opening 14 in the door is taken into account when positioning the convenience components below the reach through opening. Such features are not shown much less suggested by Tyndall. Similar considerations apply to claim 7 as amended. Tyndall positions the lamps 13 at the top of a panel which forms the walls of the portable workshop. Tyndall does not show a lamp above a reach through opening in a door because Tyndall does not have any reach through. Hence Tyndall does not suggest such a feature particularly in combination with the positioning of the lamp above the reach through opening. The clarifications in claims 6 and 7 do not involve a mere arrangement of parts because any of the three references does not show a reach through opening much less a door with a reach through opening.

- 16) The indication of allowable subject matter in claim 8 is sincerely appreciated.
- 17) Incidentally, the reach through feature is originally disclosed in the present specification at page 6, lines 8 to 9 where it is said: "The door has an opening 14 that provides access to a touchscreen 9 which can assume two positions, ...". If the opening 14 can provide access to the touchscreen it follows that the user can reach through the opening in order to touch the screen 9. This has been clarified in the specification. New matter is not involved in this clarification particularly if taken in combination with the context and with the disclosure of present Figs. 1 and 2.

- 18) Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application, including all present claims 1 to 12, are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Oliver DOEBERTIN et al.
Applicant

WGF:hc/4638
Enclosures:
postcard

By

W. G. Fasse

Wolfgang G. Fasse
Patent Attorney
Reg. No.: 21187
Tel. 207-862-4671
Fax. 207-862-4681
P. O. Box 726
Hampden, ME 04444-0726

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence with all indicated enclosures is being deposited with the U. S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail, in an envelope addressed to: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

M. Hellwig-Hill, June 21, 05

Name: M. Hellwig-Hill - Date: June 21, 2005